

### III. REMARKS

Applicants have considered the Office Action with mailing date of July 10, 2007. Claims 1 – 22 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 10, 14 and 19 have been amended.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

In the Office Action, claims 1 – 5, 8 – 10, and 13 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0133573, hereinafter “Matsuda”, with US Patent No.: 6,772,420 B1, hereinafter “Poger”, providing intrinsic evidence. Claims 6 – 7 and 11 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Matsuda as applied to claims 4 and 10, in view of US Publication No. 2002/0062485, hereinafter “Okano”

The present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of these original claims and other claims in one or more subsequent patent application that claim(s) priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 – 5, 8 – 10, and 13 – 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(a) AND CLAIMS 6 – 7 AND 11 – 12 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(a) rejection over Matsuda with Poger providing intrinsic evidence, Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. In addition to the previously presented arguments, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to disclose or teach, *inter alia*, “[that] the unique device identifier of each device entry is stored permanently for subsequent communication with the server ...”. Claim 1. Support for currently amended claim 1 is found in ¶[0033] of the originally filed patent specification of the application.

According to Matsuda at ¶[0063], the “devices employs a method where DHCP and DSN work together so that the name of the host changes as rarely as possible even if the IP address changes.” To this extent, Matsuda’s NOA architecture, at best, automates such services to minimize host name change with IP address changes. However, Matsuda certainly does not preclude host name changes. Thus with the host name and IP address being changeable, permanently storing or permanently fixing both the host name and IP address to a particular device is not possible in Matsuda. As such, Matsuda’s IP address and name management of is not equivalent to the claimed device identifier. Therefore, Matsuda’s method is not equivalent to the claimed invention.

Turning to the Office’s rationale, on page 3 of the current Office Action, and assuming *arguendo*, that Matsuda’s IP address on a MAC address inherently includes device type, Applicants submit the merits of an IP address on a MAC address, at best, provides a unique combination. However, there is no nexus between providing a unique combination and permanently storing such a combination with the device. Furthermore, the combination is subject to change because the IP

address is changeable as per Matsuda at ¶[0063]. As such, the uniqueness of the IP and MAC address combination cannot be deemed as an equivalent to the claimed “unique device identifier ... stored permanently for subsequent communication with the server”. Claim 1. Therefore, Matsuda and Poger do not anticipate the claimed invention.

With further respect to the above claimed feature, Applicants submit that Okano does not cure the deficiency of Matsuda and Poger because Okano discloses, in ¶[0035], that an “...IP address dynamically allocated ... by the DHCP ... may clear ...after the lease time storage has elapsed...”. That is, the allocation of an IP address to any one particular terminal is subject to change after a lease time expires such that “the DHCP server allocates the same IP address to another subscriber terminal”. Okano at ¶[0037]. To this extent, the status of an allocated IP address is subject to change as in Matsuda. As such, Okano’s IP address allocation is not permanent as opposed to the permanent storage of the claimed device identifier with the device. Accordingly, Okano does not cure Matsuda’s deficiency.

In the same vein, Applicants reiterate the foregoing arguments with respect to claim 1 for independent claims 10, 14 and 19 and respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1, 10 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and §103(a).

In view of the foregoing arguments, Applicants submit that all dependent claims of independent claims 1, 10, 14 and 19 are allowable based on their dependency and the respective unique features claimed therein. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejection and allow the claims.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/  
Hunter E. Webb  
Reg. No.: 54,593

Dated: September 10, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, NY 12207  
Telephone: (518) 449-0044  
Fax: (518) 449-0047

HEW/TC